

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	₹0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/463,929 02/01/2000		02/01/2000	DAVE MCLAUGHLIN	07703-268001	6964	
26211	7590	02/24/2005		EXAMINER		
		DSON P.C.	CUFF, MICHAEL A			
CITIGROUP CENTER 52ND FLOOR 153 EAST 53RD STREET				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, NY 10022-4611			•	3627 .	3627 .	
				DATE MAILED: 02/24/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		1 /	
0 /	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
(\mathcal{V})	09/463,929	MCLAUGHLIN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
-	Michael Cuff	3627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (5) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. Ithe mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 N</u>	ovember 2004.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the ments is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10 and 11</u> is/are pending in the ap	oplication.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	vn from consideration.	-	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1-8,10 and 11</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	•		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • •	` ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	amilier. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive	ion No	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	ed.	
Attachment(s)	_		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright et al. (EPO 0619564, from PCT search report)

Wright et al. shows:

Claims recite:

An automated terminal device 20

A machine

A "refilling procedure" (columns 19-20)

machine being operable to accept payment by diminishing the value of credit data stored on a card.

"a history of all debiting transactions is maintained in the master card" (column 20, lines 18-19, card can be part of the machine)

operable to maintain a record

A "handshake recognition procedure" 12)

having a memory storing identification data (column

"mutual handshake procedure by which the card and dispensing microprocessors can recognize the other as authorized to execute a requested transaction." (column 12, lines 30-33)

operable to use the stored data to recognize a card as a card authorized to transfer the accumulated value to the card Application/Control Number: 09/463,929 Page 3

Art Unit: 3627

Wright et al. shows:

Claims recite:

"The card and the value dispensing section therefore can each remain autonomous and protected against counterfeiting or fraudulent use even if the security of the other has been breached." (column 12, lines 17-20)

operable to use the identification information to recognize that a card is authorized for the purpose of inhibiting download to prevent transfer.

"The card's MPU must recognize the value dispensing section's microprocessor as valid, and vice versa, in order to execute a transaction." (column 12, lines 14-16)

matching "flags"

Because the cards can be changed/ altered so may the "flags" and other memory components.

altar flags reset memory locations

Expiration dates can be used (column 21, line 18)

flag to prohibit future transfers

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (EPO 0619564, from PCT search report) in view of Berstein et al. (EPO 0196192, from PCT search report)

Page 4

Wright et al., as explained above, shows all of the limitations of the claims except for the use of a test card.

Berstein et al. teaches a transaction terminal with a supervisory card 20. (page 6) The card allows several "supervisory modes" including for alteration of data stored in the memory 8 and a test mode for verifying proper operation of the unit.

Based on the teaching of Berstein et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Wright et al. transaction system such that its supervisory card could allow the Berstein test functions in order to verify proper operation of the unit.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/8/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the reference does not show a machine keeping a record of the accumulated value of payments made. First, applicant only claimed a machine operable of doing this. Second, the examiner stated in the rejection that the master card was being considered to be part of the machine and meets the metes and bounds of the broadly recited claim language.

Applicant asserts that the reference is significantly different form the stop card that can be "recognized" as "authorized for the purpose of inhibiting downloading". The examiner does not concur. First, applicant only claimed a machine operable of doing this. Second, a "stop card" is not claimed and should not be argued. Third, the

Art Unit: 3627

autonomous nature of the card and value dispensing section for security reasons allows the machine to recognize the card as fraudulent and as a result authorizes the prevention of transfer.

Applicant asserts that claims 6 and 11 use a test card, which is not shown in the '564 reference. The examiner concurs. These claims were inadvertently placed in the 102 rejection instead of the 103 rejection. This has been corrected with a non-final office action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0610 or, after 4/13/05 (571)272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/463,929

Art Unit: 3627

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Cuff

February 22, 2005